

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the courteous and helpful telephone interview granted Applicants' representative on May 31, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' representative proposed an amended claim 1 which the Examiner indicated appeared to be allowable over the cited art of record. The Examiner suggested, however, that the amended claim be presented in an RCE application so that it could be fully considered. Amended claim 1 herein corresponds to the claim proposed during the interview, and claims 11 and 20 herein have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1.

Support for the amendments to the claims can be found, for example, in Figure 48 and the description of steps 4800-4850 illustrated in Figure 48 on page 118 of the specification. Additional support can also be found in Figures 1 and 2 and their descriptions on pages 21-31 of the specification.

Claims 1, 11 and 20 are pending in the present application and have been amended, and claims 2-10 and 12-19 were canceled to expedite prosecution. No claims were added. This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,961,925 to Callahan et al. (hereinafter "Callahan"); and has further rejected claims 1, 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,181,723 to Luk et al. (hereinafter "Luk"), and as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0194076 to Comp et al. (hereinafter "Comp").

As indicated above, each of independent claims 1, 11 and 20 have been carefully amended to clearly distinguish over Callahan, Luk and Comp and are believed to be allowable over the references in their present form. In addition, and as suggested by the Examiner during the interview, computer program product claim 11 has been further amended to recite that the computer program product is "recorded" in a recordable-type computer readable medium; and system claim 20 has been further amended to positively recite "one or more processors."

II. Conclusion

For at least all the above reasons, Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 11 and 20 and have canceled claims 2-10 and 12-19 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendment and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter that the Examiner has indicated appears to be allowable. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: June 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald H. Glanzman/

Gerald H. Glanzman
Reg. No. 25,035
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants